arXiv:1502.04522v2 [math.CV] 18 Mar 2015

Phragmén–Lindelöf principles for generalized analytic functions on unbounded domains

Isabelle Chalendar
Université de Lyon; CNRS; Université Lyon 1; INSA de Lyon; Ecole Centrale de Lyon
CNRS, UMR 5208, Institut Camille Jordan
43 bld. du 11 novembre 1918, F-69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France
E-mail: `chalendar@math.univ-lyon1.fr`

Jonathan R. Partington
School of Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, U.K.
E-mail: `J.R.Partington@leeds.ac.uk`

March 19, 2015

Abstract

We prove versions of the Phragmén–Lindelöf strong maximum principle for generalized analytic functions defined on unbounded domains. A version of Hadamard's three-lines theorem is also derived.

Keywords: Phragmén–Lindelöf principle, generalized analytic function, pseudoanalytic function, three-lines theorem
MSC: 30G20, 30C80

1 Introduction

Versions of the maximum principle for complex-valued functions defined on a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ have been of interest since the development of the classical maximum modulus theorem and Phragmén–Lindelöf principle for holomorphic functions (see, e.g. [10, Chap. V]). It is important to distinguish between two types of result here. First, there is the *weak maximum principle* asserting that under certain circumstances a nonconstant function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ cannot attain a local maximum in its domain Ω: thus if Ω is bounded and f is continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$ we have

$$\sup_{z\in\Omega} |f(z)| = \sup_{z\in\partial\Omega} |f(z)|. \tag{1}$$

Second – and this will be our main concern in this paper – there is the *strong maximum principle* or *Phragmén–Lindelöf principle*. This generally applies to unbounded domains, and generally a supplementary hypothesis on f is required for the conclusion (1) to hold. For example, if $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ is analytic, where $\Omega = \mathbb{C}_+$, the right-hand half-plane $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re} z > 0\}$, then if f is known to be bounded we may conclude that (1) holds, whereas the example $f(z) = \exp(z)$ shows that it does not hold in general.

We shall use the following standard notation:

$$\partial f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{2}(f_x - if_y) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\partial} f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \overline{z}} = \frac{1}{2}(f_x + if_y).$$

For quasi-conformal mappings f, that is, those satisfying the Beltrami equation $\overline{\partial} f = \nu \partial f$ with $|\nu| \leq \kappa < 1$, the weak maximum principle holds (see, for example [4]). This fact was used in [1, Prop. 4.3.1] to deduce a weak maximum principle for functions solving the conjugate Beltrami equation

$$\overline{\partial} f = \nu \overline{\partial f}. \tag{2}$$

Their argument is based on the fact that if f is a solution to (2), then it also satisfies a classical Beltrami equation $\overline{\partial} f = \nu_f \partial f$, where $\nu_f(z) = \nu(z)\overline{\partial f(z)}/\partial f(z)$, and hence $f = G \circ h$ where G is holomorphic and h is a quasi-conformal mapping (cf. [7, Thm. 11.1.2]).

Carl [3] considered functions w satisfying equations of the form

$$\overline{\partial} w(z) + A(z)w(z) + B(z)\overline{w(z)} = 0 \tag{3}$$

and deduced a weak maximum principle for such functions, analogous to (1), under certain hypotheses on the functions A and B. We shall take this as our starting point.

For general background on generalized analytic functions (pseudo-analytic functions) we refer to the books [2, 9, 11]. The following definitions are taken from the recent paper [1].

Definition 1.1. *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. For $\nu \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{D})$ (i.e., a Lipschitz function with bounded partial derivatives), the class H^p_ν consists of all measurable functions $f : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying the conjugate Beltrami equation (2) in a distributional sense, such that the norm*

$$\|f\|_{H^p_\nu} = \left(\text{ess sup}_{0<r<1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{it})|^p \, dt \right)^{1/p}$$

is finite. Clearly for $\nu = 0$ we obtain the classical Hardy space $H^p(\mathbb{D})$. If instead ν is defined on an arbitrary subdomain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$, we may define the class $H^\infty_\nu(\Omega)$ as the space of all bounded measurable functions satisfying (2), equipped with the supremum norm.

We may analogously define spaces $G^p_\alpha(\mathbb{D})$, where $\alpha \in L^\infty(\mathbb{D})$, and in general $G^\infty_\alpha(\Omega)$, where now, for a function w we replace (2) by

$$\overline{\partial} w = \alpha \overline{w}. \tag{4}$$

Once again, the case $\alpha = 0$ is classical.

When ν is real (the most commonly-encountered situation), there is a link between the two notions: suppose that $\|\nu\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ with $\|\nu\|_\infty \leq \kappa < 1$, and set $\sigma = \dfrac{1-\nu}{1+\nu}$ and $\alpha = \frac{\overline{\partial}\sigma}{2\sigma}$, so that $\sigma \in W^{1,\infty}_{\mathbb{R}}(\Omega)$. Then $f \in L^p(\mathbb{D})$ satisfies (2) if and only if $w := \dfrac{f - \nu\overline{f}}{\sqrt{1-\nu^2}}$ satisfies (4).

We shall mainly be considering the class G^∞_α, for which it is possible to prove a strong maximum principle and a generalization of the Hadamard three-lines theorem under mild hypotheses on α, which are satisfied in standard examples. The referee has suggested that there may be a link between these assumptions and the strict ellipticity of σ, although we have not been able to show this.

2 Functions defined on unbounded domains

The following result is an immediate consequence of [3, Thm. 1], taking $A = 0$ and $B(z) = -\alpha(z)$ in (3) in order to obtain (4).

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that* Ω *is a bounded domain in* $\mathbb{C}$ *and that* w *is a continuous function on* $\overline{\Omega}$ *such that (4) holds in* Ω*, where* α *satisfies* $2|\alpha|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha|$*. Then* $|w(z)| \leq \sup_{\zeta\in\partial\Omega} |w(\zeta)|$ *for all* $z \in \Omega$.

Proof. Taking $k = 2$ in [3, Thm. 1], we require that the matrix $M = (m_{ij})_{i,j=1}^2$ be negative semi-definite, where, with $a = -2|\alpha|^2$ and $b = -\partial\alpha$, we have

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a + \operatorname{Re} b & \operatorname{Im} b \\ \operatorname{Im} b & a - \operatorname{Re} b \end{pmatrix}.$$

On calculating m_{11}, m_{22} (which must be non-positive) and $\det M$ (which must be non-negative) we obtain the sufficient conditions $-2|\alpha|^2 \pm \operatorname{Re} \partial\alpha \leq 0$ and $2|\alpha|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha|$: clearly the second condition implies the first. □

Example 2.1. In the example $\sigma = 1/x$, occurring in the study of the tokamak reactor [5, 6], we have $\alpha(x) = -\frac{1}{4x}$ and $\partial\alpha = \frac{1}{8x^2}$; thus the inequality $2|\alpha|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha|$ is always an equality.

Note that by rescaling z we may transform the equation (4) to one with $\alpha = -\frac{1}{\lambda x}$ for any $\lambda > 0$ (with the domain also changing); then the inequality requires that $2/\lambda^2 \geq 1/2\lambda$, so that if we take $0 < \lambda < 4$ the inequality is strict.

Now for $\varepsilon > 0$ we write $h_\varepsilon(z) = 1/(1 + \varepsilon z)$, and note that whenever $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}_+$ is a domain, we have that the functions h_ε satisfy

(i) For all $\varepsilon > 0$, $h_\varepsilon \in \operatorname{Hol}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$.

(ii) For all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\lim_{|z|\to\infty, z\in\overline{\Omega}} h_\varepsilon(z) = 0$.

(iii) For all $z \in \Omega$, $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} |h_\varepsilon(z)| = 1$.

(iv) For all $\varepsilon > 0$, for all $z \in \partial\Omega$, $|h_\varepsilon(z)| \leq 1$.

Suppose that $\overline{\partial} w = \alpha\overline{w}$ and that h is holomorphic; then $\overline{\partial}(hw) = \beta\overline{hw}$, where $\beta = \alpha h/\overline{h}$. Moreover,

$$\partial\beta = \partial(\alpha h)/\overline{h} = (\partial\alpha)(h/\overline{h}) + \alpha(\partial h)/\overline{h}.$$

That is, with $h = h_\varepsilon$, we have $|\beta| = |\alpha|$ and $|\partial\beta| \leq |\partial\alpha| + |\alpha||\partial h_\varepsilon|/|h_\varepsilon|$.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}_+$ *(not necessarily bounded) and that* w *is a continuous bounded function on* $\overline{\Omega}$ *such that (4) holds in* Ω *where* α *is a* C^1 *function satisfying* $2|\alpha|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha| + |\alpha||\partial h_\varepsilon|/|h_\varepsilon|$ *for all* $\varepsilon > 0$*. Then* $|w(z)| \leq \sup_{\zeta\in\partial\Omega} |w(\zeta)|$ *for all* $z \in \Omega$.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $M = \sup_{\zeta \in \partial\Omega} |w(\zeta)|$. Suppose that $M > 0$. Then by property (ii) there is an $\eta > 0$ such that for all $z \in \overline{\Omega}$ with $|z| \geq \eta$ we have $|w(z)h_\varepsilon(z)| \leq M$.

Now, by property (i) and Proposition 2.1 we have

$$\sup_{z \in \Omega \cap D(0,\eta)} |w(z)h_\varepsilon(z)| = \sup_{z \in \partial(\Omega \cap D(0,\eta))} |w(z)h_\varepsilon(z)|,$$

at least if $2|\alpha|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha| + |\alpha||\partial h_\varepsilon|/|h_\varepsilon|$.

Now $\partial(\Omega \cap D(0,\eta)) \subset (\partial\Omega \cap \overline{D(0,\eta)}) \cup (\partial D(0,\eta) \cap \overline{\Omega})$.

By hypothesis, $|w(z)| \leq M$ if $z \in \partial\Omega$, and by property (iv), $|h_\varepsilon(z)| \leq 1$ for $z \in \partial\Omega$. So $\sup_{z \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{D(0,\eta)}} |w(z)h_\varepsilon(z)| \leq M$.

By the definition of η we also have $|w(z)h_\varepsilon(z)| \leq M$ if $|z| \geq \eta$ with $z \in \overline{\Omega}$, and in particular for $z \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \partial D(0,\eta)$.

We conclude that $\sup_{z \in \Omega \cap D(0,\eta)} |w(z)h_\varepsilon(z)| \leq M$. However, $|w(z)h_\varepsilon(z)| \leq M$ whenever $z \in \overline{\Omega}$ with $|z| \geq \eta$, and hence $\sup_{z \in \Omega} |w(z)h_\varepsilon(z)| \leq M$. Now, letting ε tend to 0, and using property (iii), we have the result in the case $M > 0$.

If $M = 0$, then by the above we have that $\sup_{z \in \partial\Omega} |w(z)| \leq \gamma$ for all $\gamma > 0$, and the same holds for $z \in \Omega$ by the above. Letting $\gamma \to 0$ we conclude that w is identically 0 on Ω.

□

Example 2.2. Consider the case $\alpha = -\frac{1}{\lambda x}$ and $\partial\alpha = \frac{1}{2\lambda x^2}$. For the hypotheses of the theorem to be valid we require

$$\frac{2}{\lambda x^2} \geq \frac{1}{2\lambda x^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda x}\frac{\varepsilon}{|1 + \varepsilon z|}.$$

If $\lambda = 1$ (and by rescaling the domain we can assume this) then this always holds, since $|1 + \lambda z| \geq \lambda x$.

In the following theorem, it will be helpful to note that we shall be considering composite mappings as follow:

$$\Lambda \xrightarrow{h} \Omega \xrightarrow{w} \mathbb{C} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Lambda \xrightarrow{h} \Omega \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathbb{C}.$$

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ *is simply-connected and that the disc* $D(a,r)$ *is contained in* $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. *Let* $h : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ *be defined by* $h(z) = re^z + a$, *and let* Λ *be a component of* $h^{-1}(\Omega)$. *Set* $g_\varepsilon(z) = 1/(1 + \varepsilon g(z))$, *where* $g(z) = \log\left(\dfrac{z-a}{r}\right)$ *is a single-valued inverse to* h *defined on* Ω. *Suppose that* w *is a continuous bounded function on* $\overline{\Omega}$ *such that (4) holds in* Ω *with* α *a* C^1 *function satisfying*

$$2|\alpha|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha| + |\alpha||\partial g_\varepsilon|/|g_\varepsilon| \tag{5}$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$. *Then* $|w(z)| \leq \sup_{\zeta\in\partial\Omega} |w(\zeta)|$ *for all* $z \in \Omega$.

Proof. First we identify the equation satisfied by $v = w \circ h$, where h is holomorphic. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\partial} v &= \overline{\partial}(w \circ h) = \overline{\partial(\overline{w} \circ h)} = \overline{(\partial\overline{w} \circ h)(\partial h)} = (\overline{\partial} w \circ h)(\overline{\partial h}) \\ &= ((\alpha\overline{w}) \circ h)(\overline{\partial h}) = (\alpha \circ h)(\overline{w} \circ h)(\overline{\partial h}) = \beta\overline{v}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta = (\alpha \circ h)(\overline{\partial h})$. Note that $\partial\beta = (\partial\alpha \circ h)|\partial h|^2$, since $\partial(\overline{\partial h}) = 0$.

The condition

$$2|\beta|^2 \geq |\partial\beta| + |\beta||\partial h_\varepsilon|/|h_\varepsilon| \tag{6}$$

at a point of Λ can be rewritten

$$2|\alpha \circ h|^2|\partial h|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha \circ h|\,|\partial h|^2 + |\alpha \circ h|\,|\partial h||\partial h_\varepsilon|/|h_\varepsilon|.$$

Now $g_\varepsilon = h_\varepsilon \circ g$; thus $\partial h_\varepsilon = (\partial g_\varepsilon \circ h)(\partial h)$.

That is, (6) is equivalent to

$$2|\alpha \circ h|^2|\partial h|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha \circ h|\,|\partial h|^2 + |\alpha \circ h|\,|\partial h|^2|\partial g_\varepsilon \circ h|/|g_\varepsilon \circ h|,$$

or

$$2|\alpha \circ h|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha \circ h| + |\alpha \circ h||\partial g_\varepsilon \circ h|/|g_\varepsilon \circ h|.$$

The set Λ is open, and thus $\partial\Lambda \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$ and also $h(\partial\Lambda) \cap \Omega = \emptyset$. Moreover, since $h(\partial\Lambda) \subset h(\overline{\Lambda}) \subset \overline{h(\Lambda)}$, we get $h(\partial\Lambda) \subset \overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega = \partial\Omega$.

Since w is bounded on Ω, the function $v = w \circ h$ is bounded on Λ, and using the calculations above and Theorem 2.1 with condition (6), we see that

$$\sup_{z\in\Lambda} |v(z)| = \sup_{z\in\partial\Lambda} |v(z)|.$$

Since $h(\Lambda) = \Omega$, $\sup_{z\in\Lambda} |v(z)| = \sup_{z\in\Omega} |w(z)|$. Moreover, since $h(\partial\Lambda) \subset \partial\Omega$, we have also

$$\sup_{z\in\partial\Lambda} |v(z)| \leq \sup_{z\in\partial\Omega} |w(z)|.$$

It follows that $\sup_{z\in\Omega} |w(z)| \leq \sup_{z\in\partial\Omega} |w(z)|$ and we obtain equality.

□

We now provide a generalization of the three-lines theorem of Hadamard (see, for example [8, Thm. 9.4.8] for the classical formulation with $\alpha = 0$).

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that* a *and* b *are real numbers with* $0 < a < b$*, and let* $\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : a < \operatorname{Re} z < b\}$*. Suppose that* w *is a continuous bounded function on* $\overline{\Omega}$ *such that (4) holds in* Ω *where* α *is a* C^1 *function satisfying*

$$2|\alpha|^2 \geq |\partial\alpha| + \frac{|\alpha||\log(M(a)/M(b))|}{b-a} + |\alpha||\partial h_\varepsilon|/|h_\varepsilon| \tag{7}$$

for each $\varepsilon > 0$*. Then the function* M *defined on* $[a, b]$ *by*

$$M(x) = \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}} |w(x+iy)|$$

satisfies, for all $x \in (a, b)$*,*

$$M(x)^{b-a} \leq M(a)^{b-x} M(b)^{x-a}.$$

That is, $\log M$ *is convex on* (a, b)*.*

Proof. Consider the function g defined on $\overline{\Omega}$ by

$$h(z) = M(a)^{(z-b)/(b-a)} M(b)^{(a-z)/(b-a)},$$

where quantities of the form M^ω are defined for $M > 0$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ as $\exp(\omega \log M)$, taking the principle value of the logarithm.

Now $v := hw$ satisfies $|v(z)| \leq 1$ for $z \in \partial\Omega$, since $|h(a + iy)| = 1/M(a)$ and $|h(b + iy)| = 1/M(b)$.

Given that $\overline{\partial} w = \alpha\overline{w}$ and that h is holomorphic, then, as we have seen, $\overline{\partial}(hw) = \beta\overline{hw}$, where $\beta = \alpha h/\overline{h}$. Moreover, $\partial\beta = \partial(\alpha h)/\overline{h} = (\partial\alpha)(h/\overline{h}) + \alpha(\partial h)/\overline{h}$.

Now $\log h = \frac{z-b}{b-a} \log M(a) + \frac{a-z}{b-a} \log M(b)$, and so

$$\left|\frac{\partial h}{h}\right| = \frac{|\log M(a)/M(b)|}{b-a}.$$

Thus the condition (7) on α implies that β satisfies $2|\beta|^2 \geq |\partial\beta| + |\beta||\partial h_\varepsilon|/|h_\varepsilon|$. Hence we can apply Theorem 2.1 to v, and the result follow.

□

Remark 2.1. As in Example 2.2, rescaling z is helpful here, since if z is reparametrized as λz, then $\partial\alpha$ is divided by λ and $b - a$ is also divided by λ: thus the inequality (7) becomes easier to satisfy.

3 Weights depending on one variable

We look at two cases here, for functions defined on a subdomain of $\mathbb{C}_+$, namely weights $\alpha = \alpha(x)$ and radial weights $\alpha = \alpha(r)$. We revisit Theorem 2.1.

Since we now have $\partial\alpha = \alpha'/2$, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}_+$ (not necessarily bounded) and that w is a continuous bounded function on $\overline{\Omega}$ such that (4) holds in Ω where $\alpha = \alpha(x)$ is a C^1 function satisfying $2|\alpha|^2 \geq |\alpha'|/2 + |\alpha||\partial h_\varepsilon|/|h_\varepsilon|$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Then $|w(z)| \leq \sup_{\zeta\in\partial\Omega} |w(\zeta)|$ for all $z \in \Omega$.*

Likewise, in polar coordinates (r, θ) we have

$$\partial = \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{-i\theta}\partial_r - \frac{ie^{-i\theta}}{r}\partial_\theta\right),$$

giving the following result.

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}_+$ (not necessarily bounded) and that w is a continuous bounded function on $\overline{\Omega}$ such that (4) holds in Ω where $\alpha = \alpha(r)$ is a C^1 function satisfying $2|\alpha|^2 \geq |\alpha'|/2 + |\alpha||\partial h_\varepsilon|/|h_\varepsilon|$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Then $|w(z)| \leq \sup_{\zeta\in\partial\Omega} |w(\zeta)|$ for all $z \in \Omega$.*

Suppose now that $\alpha(x) = ax^\mu$. The condition we require is then

$$2|a|^2x^{2\mu} \geq |a\mu|x^{\mu-1}/2 + |a|x^\mu\frac{\varepsilon}{|1+\varepsilon z|},$$

which is only possible for $\mu = -1$. However, it is easy to write down polynomials in x that do not vanish at 0 but which satisfy the conditions of Corollary 3.2.

Acknowledgments.

The authors are grateful to Joseph Burrier for his assistance. They also thank the referee for some useful comments.

References

[1] L. Baratchart, J. Leblond, S. Rigat and E. Russ, Hardy spaces of the conjugate Beltrami equation. *J. Funct. Anal.* 259 (2010), no. 2, 384–427.

[2] L. Bers, *Theory of pseudo-analytic functions.* Institute for Mathematics and Mechanics, New York University, New York, 1953.

[3] S. Carl, A maximum principle for a class of generalized analytic functions. *Complex Variables Theory Appl.* 10 (1988), no. 2–3, 153–159.

[4] S.-S. Chen, On a class of quasiconformal functions in Banach spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 37 (1973), 545–548.

[5] Y. Fischer and J. Leblond, Solutions to conjugate Beltrami equations and approximation in generalized Hardy spaces. *Adv. Pure Appl. Math.* 2 (2011), no. 1, 47–63.

[6] Y. Fischer, J. Leblond, J.R. Partington and E. Sincich, Bounded extremal problems in Hardy spaces for the conjugate Beltrami equation in simply-connected domains. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 31 (2011), no. 2, 264–285.

[7] T. Iwaniec and G. Martin, *Geometric function theory and non-linear analysis.* Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2001.

[8] S.G. Krantz, *Geometric function theory. Explorations in complex analysis.* Cornerstones. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2006.

[9] V.V. Kravchenko, *Applied pseudoanalytic function theory.* With a foreword by Wolfgang Sproessig. Frontiers in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009.

[10] E.C. Titchmarsh, *The theory of functions.* Oxford University Press, London, 2nd edition, 1939.

[11] I.N. Vekua, *Generalized analytic functions.* Pergamon Press, London–Paris–Frankfurt; Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass. 1962.